



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/813,135

03/31/2004

Seiji Okura

826.1942

4913

21171 7590 06/19/2008

STAAS & HALSEY LLP  
SUITE 700  
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

JACKSON, JAKIEDA R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2626

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/19/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/813,135	<b>Applicant(s)</b> OKURA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> JAKIEDA R. JACKSON	<b>Art Unit</b> 2626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 February 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22, 23, 25 and 26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12, 16-17, 19-20, 22-23 and 25-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. In response to the Office Action mailed August 7, 2007, applicant submitted an amendment filed on February 7, 2008, in which the applicant amended and requested reconsideration with respect to the independent claims.

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant argues that Honda is not directed to a previously translated document, but rather performs the translation without the assistance of a user. Applicant argues that in contrast, claims 11, 17, 20, 23 and 26 each recited "translating an inputted original sentence.....from a document and "re-translating the whole original sentence in order to correct the translated sentence. However, in response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., user assistance) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Applicant further argues that Honda and Lee translate spoken words and not documents. Although, translating spoken words and documents, as amended, are similar in scope, Applicant's arguments are moot in view of new grounds of rejection.

In addition, Applicant argues that Honda and Lee does not teach correcting the translated sentence...by using another translated word outputted from the speech

Art Unit: 2626

recognition, since the output of the speech recognition in both Honda and Lee does not correct.....a translated sentence. Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references. Furthermore, Honda teaches a method wherein the machine translation unit provides feedback (paragraph 0063).

### ***Claim Objections***

3. Claims 1, 16, 19, 22 and 25 are objected to because of the following informalities:

- The phrase "selected another translated" is not clear grammatical English.

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Claims 11-12, 17, 20, 23 and 26** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Honda et al. (PGPUB 2005/0259319), hereinafter referenced as Honda in view of Kantrowitz et al. (PGPUB 2002/0156816), hereinafter referenced as Kantrowitz.

Regarding **claims 11, 17, 20, 23 and 26**, Honda discloses a system, method, computer-readable storage medium and computer data signal (computer medium; paragraphs 0239-0247), hereinafter referenced as a system, for translating an original sentence, comprising:

a translation unit translating an inputted original sentence into a translated sentence (translation; column 3, paragraphs 0053-0063);

a translation word input unit inputting another translation word corresponding to one of words composing the original sentence in order to replace a translation word used in the translated sentence (translation; column 3, paragraphs 0053-0063); and

a correction unit re-translating the whole original sentence in order to correct the translated sentence, by using the inputted another translation word that has been inputted into the translation word input unit if a part of speech of the inputted another translation word differs from a part of speech of the translation word to be replaced with the inputted another translation word (columns 3-4, paragraph 0063 with column 10, paragraphs 0173-0176 and column 12, paragraphs 0198-0207), but does not specifically teach translating documents.

Kantrowitz teaches a method and apparatus for learning from user self-corrections, revisions and modification comprising a machine translation application that when a user corrects translation errors, that information can be provided to the translation engine (paragraph 0022) and that the translation can be done on documents (paragraph 0022), to improve and allow learning of additional translation rules. Further

Kantrowitz teaches a help system that can suggest synonyms and introduce spelling or grammatical errors.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Honda's method as described above, to provide a computer-assisted method that allows the processing program to become an intelligent assistant, which when an error is made by the intelligent assistant is corrected, the intelligent assistance avoids similar errors in the future (paragraphs 0021-0022).

Regarding **claim 12**, Honda discloses a system wherein

if the part of speech of the translated word inputted to said translated word input unit coincides with the part of speech of another translated word to be replaced with the translated word, said correction unit partially replaces some translated word composing the sentence translated by said translation unit, with the translated word inputted to the translated word input unit (columns 3-4, paragraphs 0053-0063 with column 10, paragraphs 0173-0176 and column 12, paragraphs 0198-0207).

6. **Claims 1-10, 16, 19, 22 and 25** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee (USPN 6,06,520) in view of Honda and in further view of Kantrowitz.

Regarding **claims 1, 16, 19, 22 and 25**, Lee discloses a system, method and computer-readable storage medium (computer medium; paragraphs 0239-0247), hereinafter referenced as a system, for translating an original sentence, comprising:

a translation unit translating an inputted original sentence into a translated sentence by selecting each translated word one by one from a plurality of translated words respectively corresponding words composing the original sentence, and by combining the selected translated words (column 5, line 50 – column 6, line 11 with column 12, lines 22-49);

a speech recognition unit (recognition of the input speech) selecting another translated word matching inputted pronunciation from the plurality of translated words except for the translated word selected by the translation unit, and outputting the selected another translated word as a result of the speech recognition (column 5, lines 50-64), but does not specifically teach a correction unit correcting the sentence translated by the translation unit using the translated words outputted from the speech recognition unit.

Honda teaches a correction unit correcting the sentence translated by the translation unit using the translated words outputted from the speech recognition unit (columns 3-4, paragraph 0063 with column 10, paragraphs 0173-0176 and column 12, paragraphs 0198-0207), thereby obtaining an accurate translation result.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Lee's system wherein it comprises a correction unit correcting the sentence translated by the translation unit using the translated words

outputted from the speech recognition unit, as taught by Honda, to perform adaption of models used for speech recognition with high precision without imposing a burden on the user (column 2, paragraph 0019), but does not specifically teach translating documents.

Kantrowitz teaches a method and apparatus for learning from user self-corrections, revisions and modification comprising a machine translation application that when a user corrects translated errors, that information can be provided to the translation engine (paragraph 0022) and that the translation can be done on documents (paragraph 0022), to improve and allow learning of additional translation rules. Further Kantrowitz teaches a help system that can suggest synonyms and introduce spelling or grammatical errors.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Honda's method as described above, to provide a computer-assisted method that allows the processing program to become an intelligent assistant, which when an error is made by the intelligent assistant is corrected, the intelligent assistance avoids similar errors in the future (paragraphs 0021-0022).

Regarding **claim 2**, Lee discloses a system comprising:

a translated word dictionary file storage unit storing a translated word dictionary file in which both a word used in the original sentence and a translated word for the word are related and registered (column 5, line 65 – column 6, line 11); and



an extraction unit extracting a translated word related to each word composing the original sentence inputted to the translation unit (column 5, line 50 – column 6, line 11), wherein

said translation unit selects a translated word to be used in a translated sentence from a plurality of the translated words selected by the extraction unit (column 5, lines 50-64), and

said speech recognition unit (recognition of speech) selects a translated word matching to inputted pronunciation from a plurality of the translated words extracted by the extraction unit and have not been selected by said translation unit (column 5, lines 50-64).

Regarding **claim 3**, Lee discloses a system comprising

an instruction input unit instructing said system to replace some translated word composing the sentence translated by said translation unit with another translated word or to correct the whole translated sentence (correct; column 5, line 65 – column 6, line 11) wherein

when an instruction to correct the whole sentence translated by said translation unit is inputted to the instruction input unit, said speech recognition unit divides (divided) information indicating the inputted pronunciation and selecting a translated word matching the divided information from the plurality of translated words that correspond to the word but have not been selected by said translated unit (column 8, lines 5-12).

Regarding **claim 4**, Lee discloses a system wherein

when there is a translated word related to the translated word outputted from said speech recognition unit (recognition of input speech) in the translated words that correspond to the word but have not been selected by said translation unit, said correction unit corrects the sentence translated by said translation unit, using both the translated words not selected by said translation unit and the translated words outputted from said speech recognition unit (column 5, line 50 – column 6, line 11).

Regarding **claim 5**, Lee discloses a system wherein

if there is a relationship between translated words registered in said translated word dictionary file, information indicating the fact is further registered (stored in memory; column 19, lines 11-57), and

if information indicating that a translated word that corresponds to the word but has not been selected by said translation unit has a relationship with the translated word outputted from said speech recognition unit is registered in said translated word dictionary file (column 5, lines 50-64), said correction unit corrects the sentence translated by said translation unit, using both the translated word not selected by said translation unit and the translated word outputted from said speech recognition unit (column 19, lines 1-10).

Regarding **claim 6**, Lee discloses a system wherein

when a part of speech of the translated word outputted from said speech recognition unit differs (difference in parts of speech) from a part of speech of a translated word to be replaced before correction, said correction unit re-translates the

whole translated sentence inputted to the translation unit, using the translated word inputted to said speech recognition unit (column 14, line 49 – column 15, line 22).

Regarding **claim 7**, Lee discloses a system wherein

if the part of speech (parts-of-speech) of the translated word outputted from said speech recognition unit coincides (consistent) with the part of speech the translated word to be replaced before correction, said correction unit partially replaces some translated word composing the sentence translated by said translation unit, with the translated word outputted from said speech recognition unit (column 14, line 49 – column 15, line 22).

Regarding **claim 8**, Lee discloses a system further comprising

a category determination unit (word association) determining a category to which a topic of the original sentence inputted to said translation unit belongs, based on contents corrected by said correction unit (column 13, lines 51-58),

wherein when translating a newly inputted original sentence, said translation unit uses with priority (priority) a translated word that is frequently used (frequently used) in the category determined by said category determination unit (column 10, lines 57-61 with column 13, lines 33-37).

Regarding **claim 9**, Lee discloses a system further

comprising a translated word category information file storage unit storing a translated word category information file in which information indicating a category in which a translated word for a word used in an original sentence is frequently used is

registered (frequently used; column 10, lines 54-61 with column 13, lines 33-37),  
wherein

said category (word class) determination unit determines a category in which a translated word used when said correction unit corrects the translated sentence is frequently used, based on information registered in the translated word category information file (column 13, lines 38-58).

Regarding **claim 10**, Lee discloses a system comprising:

a category determination unit determining a category to which a topic of an original sentence inputted to said translation unit belongs (column 13, lines 51-58 with column 19, lines 1-57), wherein

information indicating a category in which a translated word registered in the translated word dictionary file is frequently used (frequently used) is further registered in the translated word dictionary file (column 10, lines 57-61 with column 13, lines 33-37 and column 19, lines 1-10),

said category determination unit determines a category in which a translated word used when said correction unit corrects the translated sentence is frequently used, based on information registered in the translated word category information file (column 19, lines 1-10), and

when translating a newly inputted original sentence, said translation unit uses with priority (priority) a translated word that corresponds to a word used in the inputted original sentence, of a plurality of translated words registered in the translated word dictionary file if information indicating that the translated word is frequently used

(frequently used) in a category determined by said category determination unit is registered in the translated word dictionary file (column 10, lines 57-61 with column 13, lines 33-37 and column 19, lines 1-10).

### ***Conclusion***

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jakieda R. Jackson whose telephone number is 571-272-7619. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 5:30am-2:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Hudspeth can be reached on 571-272-7843. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JRJ  
June 15, 2008

/David R Hudspeth/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2626